

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to improve readability. New claim 7 has been added. Support for new claim 7 can be found in the specification, at page 10, l. 3-12 and at page 24, l. 1-8, for instance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in response to the non-final Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Volk (Fig. 6; col. 3, lines 12-17; col. 5 line 63; col. 9, line 64 through col. 10, line 6; col. 10, line 18 and lines 46-68). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office has stated that "Volk discloses the instant method of making a steeply curved lens element adapted for mounting in eyewear ... wherein a lens blank is molded (col. 2, lines 12-17) with a radius of curvature less than 35 mm over a substantial portion of the front surface (see the curvatures shown in Fig. 6) ... It is rather clear from Figure 6 of Volk that the final lens has a hollow depth of greater than 8 mm in that the perpendicular distance from the optical center to the posterior curve to the edge of the lens must be much greater than 10.183 mm. The 10.183 mm is obtained by subtracting the thickness of the lens (ie, 8 mm) from the 18,183 mm dimension shown on the left side of the figure...." Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Volk patent relates to ophthalmic lens for presbyopia. As depicted in Figure 6 of the Volk patent, the outer convex surface of a workpiece that consists of

a portion of a substantially spherical optical glass or plastic bowl is ground to generate an accelerating surface. Then, as depicted in Figure 8, the workpiece is cut into three circular disks or wedge-shaped sections to make three lenses that are further processed, such as, by polishing. The workpiece, which seems to be viewed by the Office to correspond to a steeply curved lens of the presently claimed invention, includes three optical lenses. As such, the cited perpendicular distance from the optical center of the outer surface to the edge, which is 18.183 mm, is not related to the hollow depths of the lenses. As depicted in Figure 6, each lens has an optical axis passing the apical cusp of the lens. The dimension of the hollow depth of the lens, which is the perpendicular distance between the back surface of the lens at the optical axis and the edge of the lens, is not specified in either Figure 6 or the text to support the Office's assertion that the final lens has a hollow depth of greater than 8 mm. Even if one were to assume, *arguendo*, that Figure 6 were a scaled drawing, the hollow depth is estimated to be about half of the lens thickness, i.e., 4 mm, at the most. As such, the Volk patent fails to teach "etching the lens blank to provide an edged lens having a hollow depth of at least 8 mm" as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, in Figure 6 of the Volk patent, the radius of curvature of the front surface is not specified to support the Office's assertion that the radius of curvature is less than 35 mm over a substantial portion of the front surface. In fact, the front surface is ground to make intended through power of the lens. Even if one were to assume that the front surface had a spherical shape, the radius of curvature based on the horizontal distance (57.002 mm) and perpendicular distance (18.183 mm) between a point on the front surface and the apical cusp of the workpiece is about 90.9 mm, which is much larger than that of the lens (less than 35 mm) in certain

embodiments of the presently claimed invention. As such, the Volk patent fails to teach "molding a lens blank having a radius of curvature along a principle meridian of less than 35 mm over a substantial portion of a front surface thereof" as recited in claim 1. As the cited reference does not teach every element of claim 1 as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(b), withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, rendering them also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Volk.

The rejection of claim 5 is predicated on the erroneous characterization of the Volk patent, and is respectfully traversed, as pointed out above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 5 lacks foundation and should be withdrawn. Also, based on the similar reasons as set forth above to address the rejection of claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the reasons as set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this paper, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC


By: Chung S. Park *Chung S. Park* Reg. No. 33096
Registration No. 52,093
for

Date: February 28, 2007

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
650 622-2300